

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 17, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-16 are amended, and claims 18-20 are canceled. Thus, claims 1-17 are currently pending and subject to examination in the present application.

Claims 1 – 17 are being submitted for reconsideration as amended. Minor housekeeping amendments are being made to these claims. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are not being narrowed and that no new matter has been added.

The Abstract was objected to as being longer than 150 words. The Abstract is being amended herewith and a clean copy is provided. The amended Abstract is not longer than 150 words.

Claims 1 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,651,548 to French et al., hereinafter French, taken in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147042 to Vuong et al., hereinafter Vuong. Any reapplication of these rejections would be respectfully traversed.

The Office Action characterized French as disclosing a game management system for managing various games that in one case utilizes a roulette wheel with a plurality of pockets formed therein and a bet board having a plurality of bet areas formed to correspond to the pockets of the wheel. Further, French utilizes a chip that is on at least one of the bet areas while anticipating which one of the pockets the roulette ball thrown in

the wheel stops. Further, the Action contended that French discloses a second detecting means arranged on the bet board for detecting a bet position and bet value of the chip when the chip was betted on the bet area and a managing means for managing the history of the game based on a result detected by the second detecting means. Further, the Office Action contended that French discloses a payout calculating means for calculating a payout in the game based on the position of the pocket where the roulette ball stops and the value in the game detected by a first detecting means, a bet position and a bet value of the chip detected by the second detecting means. However, the Office Action is clearly mistaken.

There is no disclosure whatever in French of a payout calculating means or calculating a payout based on anything at all. At best the reference provided by the Office Action to lines 34 – 47 of column 3 refers to part of a system of French wherein the summed value of chips at a specific game chip placement area of a gaming table over a period of time is determined. For example, French discloses “the first gaming chip placement area may be a player’s bet placement area, and the method may also include identifying the player who placed the gaming chips at the player’s bet placement area during the applicable period of time.” There is no disclosure in this paragraph or any other place in French of a payout calculating means for calculating a payout on the game based on the position of the pocket where the ball stops and the value of the bet position and bet value of the chips. Apparently in French, this may be controlled by the casino game operator at that particular table. However, even that is not clear from the reference. At best, French can be said to count the number of chips and value of those

chips at a particular position for a particular period of time. This has nothing to do whatever with how they got there or with calculating any payout based on anything at all.

While Vuong does teach a roulette ball readily detected and electronically tracked on a roulette wheel to indicate where the ball ends when the wheel stops, Vuong does not teach, suggest, or disclose any payout calculating device for calculating a payout in the game based on the detected position of the pocket where the ball stops, the detected bet position and the detected bet values of chips detected by the other detecting device. Consequently, both Claims 1 and 17 are clearly distinguished over French taken in view of Vuong and are patentable thereover.

Claims 2 – 16 depend from Claim 1 and are considered to be allowable in view of the limitations discussed above of Claim 1 and the further limitations which they contain.

Consequently, it is strongly contended that clear differences exist between the present invention as claimed and the prior art relied upon by the Examiner. It is further contended that these differences are more than sufficient that the present invention would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art viewing those references.

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 024016-00074.

Respectfully submitted,



Sheree Rowe  
Registration Number 59,068

Customer Number 004372  
AREN'T FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

SR/vb

Enclosure: Clean Copy of the Abstract of the Disclosure